

them to make a living. So they have destroyed jobs. They killed the bridge to the future because they killed our bill to reorganize trade.

I worked with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], a hero of this Congress, and others who tried to bring some business sense to our international trade effort, and they have destroyed that bridge. Maybe Mr. Canter is smiling today, because he helped destroy a bridge to the future, a bridge to good-paying jobs, a bridge to increase the median income of the average American. That median income has gone down. That is why Americans have less in their pockets today, because taxes went up, because this Congress will not address the problem of overregulation. One hundred thirty-two thousand Federal employees do nothing but regulate, so we take those jobs out of New York, Pennsylvania, California, Florida, and we send them across the border.

Finally, litigation. This administration vetoed litigation reform. When you sue everybody, what do you do? You send business and industry and good-paying jobs out of this country, so they have destroyed the bridge to the future for my children, for your children. They have relegated us to \$5.15 an hour jobs. In my State, for not working, on welfare you get the equivalent of \$8.75 for not working, and you get health coverage. So why work? You have to be dumb to work at \$5.15, which they are promoting.

I urge my colleagues to look at this. Let us build bridges to the future, not destroy them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### ENVIRONMENTAL ARROGANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I chair the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands. In the early 1970's, Congress passed a law called the National Environmental Protection Act, and in 1976, the FLPMA Act on other areas that would take care of the public lands. We determined there that anything that happened on public lands, that the public would have some input on it. They would have the opportunity to have hearings; anybody,

they would have the opportunity to challenge what the Government did, so it would be adequately done without some high-handed individual coming along and shoving something down the throat of the population.

That was probably a pretty good piece of legislation. I mentioned, I chair the subcommittee, and every time we have a bill, and, Mr. Speaker, we have probably had more hearings than any other subcommittee on the Hill, the administration comes up. Here comes the BLM, here comes the Forest Service, here comes in Department of Reclamation. They say, "Mr. Chairman, there has to be more public input on this bill. We have to have more time for the public to have due process on this bill. You have got to be here and listen to these things."

I agree with most of that. People should have input. In the little State of Utah that I represent, as two other Members represent, we have some beautiful areas. We have six national monuments and a number of national parks. We have Arches, Canyonlands, Bryce, Zion, a piece of the Grand Canyon; we have some beautiful areas. Out of that, it seems like my friends from the East always want to come out and tell us how to determine our own lives.

Surprisingly enough, yesterday the President of the United States stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and announced a national monument in Utah of 2 million acres, 2 million acres. That is the size of Delaware. That is the size of Yellowstone National Park.

Lo and behold, guess who he told about it? Absolutely no one. The Governor of the State was not made aware, the two Senators were not made aware, the Members of the House, including of his own party, were not made aware. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, the legislature, and the county commissioners, nobody was told except President Clinton decided he wanted to do it.

This particular area has the largest coal reserve there is in the history, anywhere we can find in America. There is enough coal in the ground for the energy of Utah for 1,000 years, low-sulfur coal, which can be mined environmentally sound. In this area happens to be 10 cities; the first time that I know of that 10 cities now find themselves in a national park with the stroke of a pen.

How did he get the right to use that pen? He got the right because of the antiquated Antiquities Act of 1906, which said the President could preserve and protect Indian ruins. That was the theory behind it, Indian ruins; not saying you could go create things bigger than about every park, bigger than a lot of States. No, that was not the idea.

But the extreme environmental community, who wants to kill our timber, wants to kill our mining, wants to keep people from going into the wilderness and enjoying it and fishing, hunting, standing there and looking at God's beauty, no, we do not get to do that, because the President of the United States, in his great, wonderful,

awesome wisdom, greater than anybody, he had the right to say this beautiful area should be reserved.

Let me ask something, has the President been there? Has the President seen it? No, the President does not even know where it is. He could not come within 500 miles of it if you put a map down in front of him. That does stop him from coming in and signing the Antiquities law and saying, let us take care of this. Does that smack anybody of being political, considering that the environmental community is putting millions of dollars in this reelection? Does that smack anybody of that at all? Why did he not just wait? Why did he not wait until after, sitting down as we have down with every other park and national monument in the history of the State, in the history of the United States, and say, let us work this out?

No, I have never, in 26 years as an elected official, as past Speaker of the House of the State of Utah, I have never seen such arrogance in my life. I am totally disappointed in what happened.

What will this cost of the children of Utah? One billion dollars, \$1 billion they are not going to get for education. What is this going to cost the little State of Utah, the Governor and his legislature? Six and one-half billion dollars. Tell me why? What is the reason behind this? I am really disappointed at this high-handed attitude that emanates from the White House. I surely think that the people of the West have just been written off.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1996 FOR FISCAL YEARS 1997-2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution (H. Con. Res.

178), for legislation having spending or revenue effects in fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, September 17, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of September 12, 1996.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997. These levels are consistent with the recent revisions made pursuant to section 606(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act (P.L. 104-121) which provides additional new budget authority and outlays to pay for continuing disability reviews. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1997 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 602(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H.

Con. Res. 178 for fiscal year 1997 and for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1997 with the revised "section 602(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) suballocation. The revised section 602(b) suballocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on July 12, 1996.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH, *Chairman.*

Enclosures.

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 CONGRESSIONAL  
BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 178—REFLECTING  
ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 12, 1996

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1997–2001
Appropriate level (as set by H. Con. Res. 178):		
Budget authority	1,314,785	6,956,907
Outlays	1,311,171	6,898,627
Revenues	1,083,728	5,913,303
Current level:		

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 CONGRESSIONAL  
BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 178—REFLECTING  
ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 12, 1996—Continued

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1997–2001
Budget authority	856,941	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays	1,037,292	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues	1,101,569	5,973,380
Current level over (+)/under (–) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	–457,844	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays	–273,879	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues	17,841	60,077

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 1997 through 2000 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for FY 1997 in excess of \$457,844,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1997 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing any new budget or entitlement authority that would increase FY 1997 outlays in excess of \$273,879,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1997 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss in excess of \$17,841,000,000 for FY 1997 (if not already included in the current level estimate) or in excess of \$60,077,000,000 for FY 1997 through 2001 (if not already included in the current level) would increase the amount by which revenues are less than the recommended levels of revenue set by H. Con. Res. 178.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 12, 1996

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1997			1997–2001		
	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	4,996
Current level	5	5	5	55	55	55
Difference	5	5	5	55	55	–4,941
National Security:						
Allocation	–1,579	–1,579	0	–664	–664	0
Current level	–102	–102	–21	–289	–289	–34
Difference	1,477	1,477	–21	375	375	–34
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Allocation	–128	–3,700	0	–711	–4,004	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	128	3,700	0	711	4,004	0
Economic and Educational Opportunities:						
Allocation	–912	–800	–152	–3,465	–3,153	7,669
Current level	1,967	1,635	1,816	11,135	10,296	8,852
Difference	2,879	2,435	1,968	14,600	13,449	1,183
Commerce:						
Allocation	0	0	370	–14,540	–14,540	–41,710
Current level	0	0	500	200	153	1,470
Difference	0	0	130	14,740	14,693	43,180
International Relations:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Difference	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Government Reform and Oversight:						
Allocation	–1,078	–1,078	–289	–4,605	–4,605	–1,668
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	1,078	1,078	289	4,605	4,605	1,668
House Oversight:						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources:						
Allocation	–91	–90	–12	–1,401	–1,460	–59
Current level	–2	–2	1	–30	–30	9
Difference	89	88	13	1,371	1,430	68
Judiciary:						
Allocation	0	0	0	–357	–357	0
Current level	0	0	0	3	3	3
Difference	0	0	0	360	360	3
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	2,280	0	0	125,989	521	2
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	–2,280	0	0	–125,989	–521	–2
Science:						
Allocation	0	0	0	–13	–13	0

## DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 12, 1996—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1997			1997–2001		
	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	13	13	0
Small Business:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation .....	–90	–90	224	–919	–919	3,475
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	90	90	–224	919	919	–3,475
Ways and Means:						
Allocation .....	–8,973	–9,132	–2,057	–134,211	–134,618	–10,743
Current level .....	8,337	8,301	–2,840	73,452	73,471	–38,717
Difference .....	17,310	17,433	–783	207,663	208,089	–27,974
Unassigned:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total authorized:						
Allocation .....	–10,571	–16,469	–1,916	–34,897	–163,812	–38,038
Current level .....	10,204	9,836	–539	84,525	83,658	–28,362
Difference .....	20,775	26,305	1,377	119,422	247,470	9,676

## DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 602(b) suballocations (July 12, 1996)				Current level reflecting action completed as of Sept. 12, 1996				Difference			
	General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	12,960	13,380	0	0	12,960	13,340	0	0	0	40	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State .....	24,493	24,939	4,525	2,951	16	6,451	0	1,477	24,477	18,488	4,525	1,474
Defense .....	245,065	243,372	0	0	0	80,745	0	0	245,065	162,627	0	0
District of Columbia .....	719	719	0	0	719	719	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy & Water Development .....	19,421	19,652	0	0	0	6,833	0	0	19,421	12,819	0	0
Foreign Operations .....	11,950	13,311	0	0	72	8,253	0	0	11,878	5,058	0	0
Interior .....	12,118	12,920	0	0	138	4,855	0	0	11,980	8,065	0	0
Labor, HHS and Education .....	65,625	69,602	61	38	1,858	40,615	0	20	63,767	28,987	61	18
Legislative Branch .....	2,180	2,148	0	0	2,166	2,131	0	0	14	17	0	0
Military Construction .....	9,983	10,360	0	0	9,982	10,344	0	0	1	16	0	0
Transportation .....	12,190	35,453	0	0	0	23,785	0	0	12,190	11,668	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service .....	11,016	10,971	97	84	0	2,381	0	9	11,016	8,590	97	75
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies .....	64,354	78,803	0	0	365	47,492	0	0	63,989	31,311	0	0
Reserve .....	618	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	618	69	0	0
Grand total .....	492,692	535,699	4,683	3,073	28,276	247,944	0	1,506	464,416	287,755	4,683	1,567

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, September 17, 1996.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1997. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1997 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 178) and are current through September 12, 1996. A summary of this tabulation follows:

	[In millions of dollars]			
	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 178)	Current level +/- resolution	
Budget authority .....	856,941	1,314,785	–457,844	
Outlays .....	1,037,292	1,311,171	–273,879	
Revenues .....				
1997 .....	1,101,569	1,083,728	+17,841	
1997–2001 .....	5,973,380	5,913,303	+60,077	

Since my last report, dated July 22, 1996, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Agriculture Appropriations Act (P.L. 104–180), the District of Columbia Appropriations Act (P.L. 104–194), the Federal Oil & Gas Royalty Simplifications & Fairness Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–185), the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–

188), an Act to Authorize Voluntary Separation Incentives at A.I.D. (P.L. 104–190), the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–191), and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–193). The Congress has also cleared for the President's signature the Military Construction Appropriations Act (H.R. 3517), the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act (H.R. 3754), and the National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 3230). These actions changed the current level of budget authority, outlays, and revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director.

## PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 12, 1996

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
PREVIOUSLY ENACTED			
Revenues .....			1,100,355
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	843,212	804,226	
Appropriation legislation .....		238,523	
Offsetting receipts .....	–199,772	–199,772	
Total previously enacted .....	643,440	842,977	1,100,355
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Appropriations Bills:			
Agricultural Appropriations (P.L. 104–180) .....	52,345	44,922	
District of Columbia Appropriations (P.L. 104–194) .....	719	719	
Authorizations Bill:			
Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2 (P.L. 104–168) .....			–15
Federal Oil & Gas Royalty Simplification & Fairness Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–185) .....	1	1	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS SEPTEMBER 12, 1996—Continued  
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Offsetting Receipts .....	—3	—3	.....
Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-188) .....	—76	—76	579
An Act to Authorize Voluntary Separation Incentives at the A.I.D. (P.L. 104-190) .....	—1	—1	.....
Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-191) .....	305	315	590
Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-193) .....	10,080	9,702	60
Total enacted this session .....	63,370	55,579	1,214
PASSED PENDING SIGNATURE			
Military Construction Appropriations (H.R. 3517) .....	9,982	3,140	.....
Legislative Branch Appropriations (H.R. 3754) .....	2,166	1,917	.....
National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 3230) .....	—102	—102	.....
Total passed pending signature .....	12,046	4,955	.....
APPROPRIATED ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	138,085	133,781	.....
Total Current Level <sup>1</sup> .....	856,941	1,037,292	1,101,569
Total Budget Resolution .....	1,314,785	1,311,171	1,083,728
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution .....	457,844	273,879	.....
Over Budget Resolution .....			—17,841

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$34 million in outlays for funding of emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

### THE INCREASE IN ILLEGAL DRUG USE AMONG TEENAGERS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to talk about the drug crisis in America, the problem we are faced with, some of the reasons for it, and at least one very good idea to address the problem.

I have devoted a lot of my time and my staff's time over the last year and a half on this issue, because I am convinced that our national leaders must take tangible steps to help communities across our country to send a clear and consistent message at every level that drugs are wrong and that they are dangerous. If we do not, I believe our society will be in real trouble.

It is not just about drug abuse, as I will explain later with the chart, because drug abuse impacts a whole host of other social problems we face in this country. I am actually encouraged by the recent press attention we see on this issue. This chart shows that in fact the headlines are starting to appear, people are starting to pay attention to the fact that we do, once again, have what is becoming a drug epidemic in this country. Though politics are certainly playing a role in it, I am glad the President is finally talking about this issue. I am glad that he has appointed a real leader, Gen. Barry McCaffrey, to be his new drug czar.

But so much more needs to be done. I have three children of my own. I know that what influences their decisions, what shapes their attitudes, is what my wife and I say, what we do, what their teachers tell them, what they hear in church, what they see on television, what they hear on the radio, what their friends tell them. We need to work together to fashion innovative solutions to this terrible drug problem in this country that will actually make a difference in the lives of my kids and all of our children.

This is why I have spent the last year and a half working with people in the field, those who have devoted literally decades to this issue, to reducing substance abuse, activists back home like Jackie Butler, Hope Taft, Tammy Sullivan; people at the State level, including my Governor, George Voinovich and his director of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, Lucille Fleming; people at the national level like Jim Burke, Tom Hedrick, with the Partnership for a Drug Free America, Jim Koppel of CADCA, Bill Oliver, Doug Hall of PRIDE, and many others.

We have also spent a lot of time talking to kids and parents, teachers and coaches, religious leaders, business people, and many others about the problem at the local level, and what we should do about it.

Two clear things have emerged. First, national leadership is important. It keeps the issue on the agenda, it keeps it in the media, as we see here, and helps send a clear and consistent message that has a direct impact on the use of drugs.

The research could not be clearer on this issue. As important as national leadership, of course, is sustained national leadership, not on again-off again.

The second thing we have learned is that leadership must recognize that this problem is probably best addressed at the community level, at the local level. We need everyone who influences the decision of a child to be involved: The parents, the coaches, the teachers, our President, Members of Congress, community leaders, kids themselves. Until we understand that leadership has to be used to mobilize at each of these levels, I do not think we will ever adequately address the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the community anti-drug coalition initiative that we have started here in the Congress, that has been spreading around the country for the last few years, is one attempt to bring sustained national leadership where we will have the most impact.

Alex de Tocqueville, when he visited this country over a century ago, he

tried to describe America to people in Europe. One thing he said was, "All of the efforts and resources of the citizens", the citizens of America, "are turned to the eternal well-being of the community."

I think that is a pretty good observation. I think it continues to be true today, the recognition that people's energies are often devoted primarily at their neighborhoods and at their communities, where they feel they can have the most direct impact. I think that tells us a lot where we as Members of Congress ought to be devoting some of our energies, at the community level.

Drugs are a serious concern among all Americans. If you look at the most recent Gallup Poll results, or you look at the most recent Wall Street Journal NBC Poll, it is clear drugs and crimes are the number one issue most Americans believe we must address. It is also interesting when you ask parents what the most serious problem is facing our youth, they say drug abuse.

As interesting, when you ask kids themselves, when you ask our young people, what is the most serious concern you face, and this is teenagers, they do not say it is getting a job, they do not say it is their education. What do they say? Drugs. So kids themselves and their parents have recognized that. Frankly, I think they are far out in front of their elected leaders.

Just how big is this problem? to try to put it in some perspective, I will say that in just over a generation, the use of illegal drugs in this country has increased 40-fold, 40-fold. It is a huge problem. As I said earlier, it is not just about drug abuse, because drug abuse affects so many other things in this country.

Let me give the Members just a few examples on this chart. Crime and violence; over half of the violent crime